

Atty. Dkt. No. 02CR340/KE

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

No claims are requested to be cancelled.

Claims 1, 10, 12 and 13 are currently being amended. No new matter is added.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-21 remain pending in this application.

In paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Office Action, claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Applicants have amended claim 12 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is respectfully requested.

In paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner has asked about common ownership. Applicants' attorney believes that the co-inventors were under an obligation to assign the invention to the assignee at the time of the invention.

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 2003/0122748 (Ho) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,049,865 (Nakamura). The Examiner states:

As to claims 1, 10, 13, 18, Ho discloses a passive matrix organic light emitting diode display system comprising: a plurality of pixels (10, Fig. 1) configured for emitting light when energized by one of a plurality of row electrodes and one of a plurality of column electrodes; a plurality of column drivers (Q1, Q2, Q3, Fig.

Atty. Dkt. No. 02CR340/KE

1) configured for energizing the plurality of column electrodes; a plurality of row drivers (Q4, Q5, Fig. 1) configured for energizing the plurality of row electrodes. It is noted that Ho does not specifically disclose at least two of the plurality of row drivers are configured to simultaneously energize at least two of the plurality of row of electrodes.

Nakamura discloses a matrix type of the flat panel display device similar to Ho. Nakamura further discloses two of the plurality of row drivers (32, 42, Fig. 1) are configured to simultaneously energize at least two of the plurality of row of electrodes (e.g. odd numbered scanning electrode and even numbered scanning electrode, see abstract and Figs 8A-8O). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Ho with the features of simultaneously energizing two row electrodes as taught by Nakamura so that two different scanning modes can be obtained.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Ho and Nakamura are referred to below as the cited art.

Independent claims 1, 10 and 13 have been amended to recite an isolation feature related to the column drivers and the two row electrodes that are simultaneously energized. Claim 1 recites that "the first set of column drivers do not energize pixels energized by the second row driver and energize pixels energized by the first row driver." Claim 10 recites that "the second column electrode is electrically isolated from first pixels." Claim 13 recites "wherein pixels associated with the first row electrode do not share the column electrodes with pixels associated with the second row electrode." Therefore, each of the independent claims specifically recites structure related to the isolation feature.

As described throughout the patent application, the row electrodes that are energized simultaneously have independent column electrodes. See Figure 5, p. 9, ¶¶ 28-29. Such a structure is not shown, described or suggested in Ho or Nakamura. As the Examiner admits, Ho does not even describe column or row drivers that are simultaneously energized. Although Nakamura discloses row drivers that are arguably simultaneously energized, the row drivers have

Atty. Dkt. No. 02CR340/KE

a single column driving circuit (X-electrode drive circuit 2). Separation or isolation of the column driver circuitry with respect to the row electrodes that are simultaneously energized is not shown, described or suggested. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-9, independent claim 10 and its dependent claims 11-12, and independent claim 13 and its dependent claims 14-21 are patentable over the cited art.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 18-1722. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 18-1722. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 18-1722.

Respectfully submitted,

Date June 29, 2005By Kyle Eppele

ROCKWELL COLLINS, INC.
400 Collins Road, NE
Cedar Rapids, IA 52498
Telephone: (319) 295-8280
Facsimile: (319) 295-8777
Customer No. 26383

Kyle Eppele
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 34,155